INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

MURAYAMA, Tomiji Direct by Mr. Comyns Carr Cross by Mr. Logan NOON RECESS	3744
Cross by Mr. Logan NOON RECESS	37447 37447 37453
NOON RECESS	Ave. 1
	37453
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Logan	3745
Redirect by Mr. Comyns Carr	37460
(Witness excuse	ed) 3746
KONOYE, Mrs. Yasuko	3746
Direct by Mr. Comyns Carr	3746
Cross by Mr. Logan	3746
AFTERNOON RECESS	3747
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Logan Cross (cont'd) by Dr. KIYOSE Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Warren	3748 3749 3749

INDEX

nof

EXHIBITS

	1			
No.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description For Ider	In t.Evidence
4043 (Item	25)	3746	Telegram from German Ambassador Ott in Tokyo to the State Secretary dated 27 May 1939	37408
3104(2		3458	Telegraphic Instruction to Ambassador NOMURA as Reply Material Con- cerning the French Indo-China Problem	37417
3104(2) ,	3747	(Exhibit Number Correction by Clerk of the Court)	37421
3211	,	3748	Memorandum from Major F.D. Merrill, Cavalry, U. S. Army, to Liaison Officer, Office of Chief of Staff, G-2, Washington, dated 26 December 1941	37422
		i v	MORNING RECESS	37428
2779	1	3,474	Foreign Office Memorandum dated 30 August 1938 re a Conversation between the Accused OKA and KAGESA	37432
3358		3749	Affidavit of MURAYAMA, Tomiji	37445
3357-A	X	3750	Affidavit of Mrs. Yasuko KONOYE	37461
3357-в	Yes X	3750-A	Affidavit of Mrs. Yasuko KONOYE	37461
Le tals		2 3 3 V		

INDEX

ef

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Poc.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For In Ident Evidence
		3751	The HARADA-SAIONJI Memoirs	37464
	3752		Volume from which Notes of the HARAFA Diary were taken	37492
2989	3753		Excerpt from the Diary of Marquis KIDO, 27 February 1937	37492

Thursday, 15 January 1948

8 9

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL
FOR THE FAR EAST
Court House of the Tribunal
War Ministry Building
Tokyo, Japan

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

Appearances:

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABIE JUSTICE JU-AO MEI, Member from the Republic of China, not sitting from 1330 to 1600; HONORABIE JUSTICE B. V. A. ROLING, Member from the Kingdom of the Netherlands, not sitting from 1500 to 1600.

For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

Duda & Spratt

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except SHIRATORI, who is represented by counsel. The Sugamo prison surgeon certifies that he is ill and unable to attend the trial today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

Judge Nyi.

I shall offer in evidence IPS document No. 4043, item 21, a captured German document, which is a telegram from the German Ambassador in Tokyo to the Reich Foreign Minister, bearing date 20 May 1939, in contradiction of the testimony of ITAGAKI at page 30,505, in which he denied sending to Ambassador Ott a written declaration to the effect that the army was working for the signing of the pact secretly and simultaneously with the signing of the German-Italian pact in order to give the pact the character of a tri-partite alliance.

On page 30,505 ITAGAKI was asked:
"Did you not on the 20th of May, 1939,
send one by the name of MACHIJIRI to Ambassador Ott
with a written declaration to the effect that the
army was working for the signing of the pact secretly

and simultaneously with the signing of the German-Italian Pact in order to give the pact the character of a tripartite alliance?"

The answer was: "No, that is not so."

Therefore, in our submission this document will both impeach the credibility of ITAGAKI's testimony and also substantiate the prosecution's charges against him because the document clearly shows the army was steering the course in the matter of the tri-partite alliance.

MR. MATTICE: The accused ITAGAKI objects to the introduction in evidence of this document.

THE PRESIDENT: Judge Nyi.

JUDGE NYI: I am sorry; I didn't hear the ruling of the Court, if there is any.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is upheld and the document rejected.

JUDGE NYI: I shall next offer in evidence
IPS document No. 4043, item 25, a captured German
document, being a *elegram from the German Ambassador in
Tokyo to the State Secretary, bearing date 27 May
1939, for the purpose of contradicting the testimony
of ITAGAKI on page 30,506, which in effect was a
denial that the army contended for the automatic
entrance into a state of war against England and

France.

. 1

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Mattice.

MR. MATTICE: Objected to on behalf of the accused ITAGAKI for the reason the same being hearsay, has no probative value.

THE PRESIDENT: What have you to say, Judge Nyi2

JUDGE NYI: In our submission, this is not mere hearsay because this was confirmed after talk with the spokesman of the army. This document is extremely important because it involves the Supreme War Council, the War Minister, and the Prime Minister, and the spokesman almost confirmed everything that was previously heard by the Embassy, the German Ambassador.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I object on behalf of the defendant OSHIMA. First, the document is repetitions and immaterial. The first item, namely, that the Foreign Minister communicated to Berlin the decision of the Five Ministers' Conference which had been objected to by the War Minister appears in court exhibit 2230 on May 20. Next, as to the reasons for the army's objections, the witness YAMAWAKI, Masataka, who appeared on behalf of the defendant ITAGAKI, testified in his affidavit, court exhibit

3301, as follows:

Correction: The army's objection to the decision.

Namely, that the Japanese Government's fundamental policy toward the proposed alliance between Japan, Germany, and Italy was that the question of whether or not Japan would aid Germany militarily in the event of a German war with England and France would depend entirely on circumstances. This was the fundamental policy of the Japanese Government, and War Minister ITAGAKI faithfully adhered to this policy. Judge Nyi did not crossexamine regarding this statement by YAMAWAKI, in spite of the fact that Judge Nyi conducted extensive cross-examination of the witness in regard to other points.

Next, as regards the fact that the Japanese Ambassador in Berlin did not immediately communicate this document to the German Government, this portion of this document is repetitious of court exhibit 2230.

THE PRESIDENT: Your objections must be stated briefly. They are far too long. They are unreasonably long. If the document is as important to you at this stage as your long argument suggests, you must have a lot to say about it in your summation.

I doubt whether we will hear much about it there.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: The remainder of my objection will be very brief, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it is too long already, far too long. Put your point shortly, whatever is left.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: That portion of this document beginning with the words "Pointed out," which is
paragraph 2, down to the end, has no connection with
the issues involved in this case and is, therefore,
irrelevant and immaterial.

Furthermore, this cocument mentions an army spokesman, but according to the German original, the word is "Gewahrsmann," meaning "person who gave information." Therefore, I consider this document to be strictly based on hearsay.

THE PRESIDENT: We do not want to hear you,

By a majority, the objections are overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution accument 4043, Item 25, will receive exhibit No. 3746.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3746 and received in evidence.)

JUDGE NYI: With the permission of the .

Tribunal, I shall read exhibit No. 3746, omitting the formal part, beginning with "Strictly secret."

"Strictly secret -- Reference: Telegram of 23rd, No. 217.

"On hearing rumors of new cabinet struggles

3 4

7

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

18

19

20

22

23

over alliance asked Army for information whereupon spokesman gave an exposition which can explain the contradictions reported in preceding telegram: Foreign Minister wired decision of the Five Ministers of 20 May to Berlin and Rome in a form which Army rejects, because it does not automatically fix the entrance into a state of war against England and France, but proposed to make it dependent on the lituation at the time. Japanese Ambassadors Berlin Rome had refused transmittal. Prime Minister had ascertained this departure from the decision after it had left and had delivered /his/ own correction to cabinet. With the express approval of Supreme War Council War Minister is again struggling together with the Prime Minister for clear conception of this basic question.

"Pointed out particularly to spokesman that theoretical reservations of Navy vis-a-vis Western Powers tood in crassest contradiction of their procedure in Amoy and Western Powers themselves are working for a Soviet alliance that would necessarily affect Japan seriously.

"Spokesman personally counted on possibility of resignation of Foreign Minister. Private secretary of Prime Minister who, moreover, seemed concerned regarding remaining /in power/ of whole cabinet also

expressed similar view. Hear from other source that Emperor had made agreement /between/ Army and Navy a condition for his assent in answer to Prince KAN-IN, who represented the alliance demands of the Army.

"Regarding stubborn resistance of opponents
of alliance rumors are cropping up of terroristic plans
of radical groups. OTT."

I shall now offer in evidence IPS document
No. 4047-E, Item 6, a captured German document, being
a telegram from the German Ambassador in Tokyo to the
State Secretary, bearing date 3 August 1939, to contradict the testimony of ITAGAKI on pages 30,510 to
30,512, in which he denied, in effect, that the army
opposed the settlement of the Tientsin question with
the British on the ground that it would hurt the chances
for the German-Japanese military alliance; and for
the accitional purpose of contradicting ITAGAKI's
testimony, page 30,512, in which he denied that he
urged convocation of a Five Ministers' Conference prior
to the 3d day of August, 1939, at which he was willing
to push an all-out alliance even at the risk of a
cabinet crisis.

On page 30,512 the question was put to ITAGAKI: "Did the Army oppose the Anglo-Japanese understanding because it would hurt the chances of a

German-Japanese alliance?" The answer was: "The Army did not oppose."

Also on page 30,512, the question was put to ITAGAKI: "Let me ask you: Did you not urge convocation of a Five Ministers Conference a few days prior to the 3d day of August, 1939, at which you were willing to push an all-out military alliance, even at the risk of a cabinet crisis?" The answer was: "No, not at all."

This document will prove the stubborn attitude of the Army in working for this alliance even at the expense of good relations between Japan and England. We therefore submit it is important and of probative value.

MR. MATTICE: Objected to on behalf of the defendant ITAGAKI, if the Tribunal please. If the prosecution wishes to impeach Mr. ITAGAKI upon the matters outlined by Judge Nyi, they might well have done so by calling Ott as a witness. I submit that a purported or an alleged telegram received in the offices of the German Government in Berlin purporting to have been sent by Ott, and even if actually sent by him, falls far short of establishing the fact.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

JUDGE NYI: This concludes our presentation

of documents on order list No. 2, and Mr. English will present documents on order list No. 3.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. English.

MR. ENGLISH: May it please the Tribunal, we offer in evidence IPS document No. 3090-D, marked as prosecution exhibit 3455 for identification, record 33,189, which is the record of the Imperial Conference of 13 November 1940. It is offered to rebut the accused MUTO's claim that his intervention at Imperial Conference was merely clerical and nothing more than as a distributor of copies of documents to those attending the conference, record 33,180, and that he did not recall having attended this conference, record 33,182.

On page 33,186, the Tribunal said: "Therefore, according to our previous practice, the objection
is upheld, and your proper place to put it in is in
rebuttal." And on page 33,188 the Tribunal said: "I
think you have sufficiently laid the foundation."

.16

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: May it please the Tribunal, this document is objected to on behalf of the accused MUTO on the grounds of its lacking both importance and probative value.

First, in the matter of its unimportance, it has already been clearly established and undenied by the accused that he attended many Imperial and Liaison Conferences and this therefore is unmeconsary to prove that point. Further on the matter of importance, as the accused pointed out on cross-examination, it is not at all clear what was discussed at this conference.

The document seems to aim merely at showing who was present at that conference and I should like to discuss that further under the matter of probative value. At the bottom of page two there are two lists of persons, the first one headed "Those present" and the second one "...those who were invited to attend..."

THE PRESIDENT: Do you suggest this is repetitive and that there is already proof of who was present?

R. COLE: Sir, I claim it is repetitive as regarding attending such conferences in general. We deny absolutely that he attended this one.

I beg the Court's pardon, I must make a

correction. He did not deny absolutely that he attended; he merely said that he had no recollection of it whatever.

3 THE PRESIDEAT: It may be important as proving who was present at a certain Imperial Conference.

AR. COLE: I should like to make one more point, if the Tribunal please.

THE PRESIDENT: It contains a list of those present and those invited.

MR. COLE: Yes, sir.

2

6

8

10

19

20

21

May I make one further point, if your Honor 11 please? In the middle of page 3 is the statement "Written by Secretary OGURA." The sentence just 14 preceding says "I presume the Council proceeded according to the order described in the appended 15 papers." If the Secretary were present he certainly 16 17 would know not only who attended but whether the 18 agenda was followed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, on behalf of the accused KIDO I object to the first page and a half of this document. It adds nothing except to show perhaps that as Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal 25 he made arrangements for this meeting which certainly

doesn't touch any part of the Indictment. If anything, it is favorable to him; but it seems to me it is a frightful waste of time to read all that for the record. And also --

THE PRESIDENT: We do not went to hear you, Mr. Logan.

Do you wish to add anything, Mr. English?

MR. ENGLISH: May I be heard, your Honor?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, if you insist, but few of us can see any importance in this document.

MR. ENGLISH: The document is important -THE PRESIDENT: I do not think that you will succeed in altering that opinion of the majority.

By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. ENGLISH: We offer in evidence IPS document 3104(2), marked prosecution exhibit 3458 for identification, a duly authenticated official document of the Japanese Government which the accused MUTO challenged as to identity and authenticity and which he failed to recall. It is a draft of reply material, dated 11 July 1941, submitted at the request of the Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau MUTO to the Foreign Office for use by Ambassador NOMUKA in replying to questions of the United States Government concerning the French

3 4

.

4 5

Indo-China problem and the increase of military forces stationed in Manchuria. The foundation is to be found on pages 33,188 to 33,202 of the record.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: May it please the Tribunal, this document is objected to, or rather its admission, on the questions of probative value and importance.

I call the Tribunal's attention to the fact that nowhere in the document is there an official seal or signature, either of the accused or of any ministry. On page 1 in the middle there is a reference to the Military Affairs Bureau, accompanied by what appears to be a translator's note inserted; and the question arises: By whom was that inserted? The last clause in the paragraph numbered 1 says the Army and Navy are asked to confer and discuss the matter. That surely raises doubt as to whether this came officially from the War Ministry or any bureau in it.

I contend, lastly, that the document has no importance at this point in the trial because the United States-Japanese negotiations had been fully covered.

authenticated document of the Japanese Government. It shows the activities of the accused MUTO in connection

with the negotiations and page 3 of the processed copy, the last sentence, shows that this document was sent at the request of the Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau who at that time was the accused MUTO.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3104(2), now exhibit 3458 for identification only, will be marked as received in evidence and will retain the same exhibit number.

(Whereupon, exhibit No. 3458, previously marked for identification, was received in evidence.)

MR. ENGLISH: (Reading)

"/attached paper/

"(1) We have no objection to the draft of telegraphic instruction to Ambassador NOMURA as reply material concerning the French Indo-China Problem as submitted by the Navy.

"(2) As reply material for the Northern Problem, this draft is offered by the Army according to the purport of Paragraph 2, mentioned above.

"/Top Secret/ Stamped

"/Marginal notes/

2

5

7

9

10

12

13 14

15

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

"Forwarded for reference.

"When the Foreign Office Draft is ready, please discuss it - this is also the Minister's desire (written in red ink).

"(Draft) Telegraphic Instructions to Ambassador NOLIURA as Reply Material concerning the Northern Problem.

"July 11, 1941, the Military Affairs Bureau, War Hinistry /inserted/

"Explanation

"1. This draft is to be submitted to the Foreign Office as reply material when the U.S. Government questions the Ambassador after the fact of strengthening of the military forces stationed in Manchuria becomes known, (at least for the time being such a thing cannot be made clear) /marginal note/ As the time of dispatching the telegram is a military top secret requiring ample consideration, the Army and Navy are asked to confer and discuss the matter.

"2. In view of the circumstance when she sent her military forces to Siberia and next to Iceland, this draft is made with the object of not giving a pretext to, as well as preventing, the United States from making its influence felt in Kamchatka or elsewhere under the pretense of the self-defense

24

2

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and security.

"Telegraphic Instruction (Draft)

with the great interest the development of the war between Germany and Soviet Russia. Japan and Manchukuo directly border the Soviet Union and moreover we are making efforts to establish the East Asiatic Co-prosperity Sphere. Therefore, our national defense could be endangered through the effects of the European conflict felt in the Far East, or the third power's sphere of influence /Marginal note/ meaning the sale offer of military bases of operation, etc. of Enkai Province. /TN. Maritime Province where Viadivostok is situated and Kamchatka/ could spread to the Soviet territories in the Far East by taking advantage of the Russo-German War, but Japan absolutely cannot allow such eventualities to happen.

"We are, therefore, strengthening our defensive military forces within the minimum limit required in this regard for the sole purpose of preparing ourselves for just such a serious state of affairs.

1 2

3

5 6

9 10

11 12

13 14

16

17

15

18 19

20

21 22

24 25

23

"H. E. The AMERICA BUREAU Chief

"7 July

"Lieutenant Colonel NINOMIYA (NINOMIYA seal) "Following drafts are to be sent to you from the Navy.

- "1. 'Telegraphic instructions draft to Ambassador NOMURA as materials for answering questions on our penetration into French Indo-China.'
- "2. 'Telegraphic instructions draft to Ambassador NOMURA as materials for answering questions on the management of Northern problems.

"Concerning the above-mentioned problems.

- "1) It is quite dangerous if the matters especially as regards the North leak through to the U.S.A. too early. It is desirable that you discuss the time, etc., at the liaison round-table conference.
- "2) As to the aforesaid plan (1), there is generally no objection on the part of the Chief of the Bureau, but about plan (2) the material for answering questions on the management of the Northern question, there are further opinions on the part of the Army.

"I report to you by the request of the Chief of Military Affairs Bureau."

IPS document 3211 is offered in evidence to rebut the denial of the accused MUTO that he ever had a

9 10

11 12

14 15

13

17

18

19

16

20

21

22 23

24 25

conversation on 8 October 1941 in his office with Major F. D. Merrill, of the staff of the United States Militar Attache in Tokyo, to the effect that there was no longer any real hope of settling the American-Japanese problems by talks between diplomats and therefore the problem was one for the armies to settle. Foundation, record 33,206 to 33,208.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Correction for the last exhibit number announced: Prosecution document 3104(2) will receive exhibit No. 3747.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: This document is objected to on behalf of the accused MUTO, first, on the basis of probative value as it is only a memorandum, unsworn and unsigned, largely regarding personal matters. Also, it was written three months after the alleged event.

In the matter of importance, it adds nothing because these matters have already been thoroughly discussed.

MR. ENGLISH: This is an official report, an official document of the United States Government. It impeaches MUTO who denied that he had this conversation and shows the activities of the accused MUTO in Octobe. . 1941, in connection with the negotiations then going on between Japan and the United States.

THE PRESIDENT: It is important, if at all, only because it suggests that MUTO is not telling the truth.

MR. ENGLISH: I think it is important, your Honor, in that it shows that the Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau was active in matters in connection with

THE PRESIDENT: Is that the only evidence on that?

MR. FNGLISH: If you will read the last eight lines of the first paragraph --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, independently of its effect on the credibility of MUTO, you say it is important to show his association with the negotiations.

By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLEFK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 321 will receive exhibit No. 3748.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3748 and received in evidence.)

MR. ENGLISH: (Reading)

"WAR DEPARTMENT

"U. S. MILITARY MISSION TO CHINA

" 'AMMISCA'

2

5

7

the negotiations.

8

10

.12

13

15_.

17 18

19

20

22

23

"(Photostatic copy)

"529 Merchant Street, Rangoon, Burma, December 26, 1941

"(Stamp) (Rec'd-G-2 May 23, 1942)

"Memorandum: For Liaison Officer, Office of Chief of Staff, G-2, Washington, D. C."

THE PRESIDENT: Must you read all of this?

MR. ENGLISH: Just the first paragraph, your

Honor. (Reading)

"1. On October the 8th I was invited to call at the General Staff, Tokyo and upon arrival was immediately taken to the War Office and presented to General Akira MUTO, Chief of the Military Affairs Department. General MUTO apologized for not being able to speak English and stated that he had been informed that I had been ordered to leave Japan. Inasmuch as I had just returned from a tour of duty with the Japanese Army, he said, it was his desire to explain to me the seriousness of the international situation. This explanation repeated the usual statements of the desire of Japan to maintain peace and took over an hour. Following this General MUTO said, 'There is no longer any real hope of settling the problems between our countries by talks between diplomats. The matter is one for the armies to settle. It is possible that the armies can do this with-

19 20

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

out fighting therefore I think that you should erdeavor to report to your superiors that Japan has a good army. I do not care how you criticize us but you should be careful to say only the actual facts. If you cannot convey to your people the true state of things I am afraid that I must give you a very unpleasant farewell present. This present is simply that if an understanding is not reached you will be fighting us in six weeks in Manila. The conversation with General MUTO was reported to the Military Attache and to the Ambassador and submitted in writing."

We tender in evidence --

I will read at the request of the defense further from the paragraph just read:

"I am merely reporting the main features in the event the Attache was unable to forward my report. It has very little value except as an interesting forecast of the opening date of the war."

K a 1 p 2 e a 3 u 4 & 5 K n 6 a 7 p 8

We tender in evidence IPS document 3217-A, to rebut the accused MUTO's denial that War Minister HATA after conferring with Vice-Minister ANAMI and Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau MUTO, then with the Big Three with MUTO in attendance, and later with the members of the Supreme War Council, of which MUTO was the Chief Secretary, called at the official residence of the Prime Minister and delivered to him the army's consensus of opinion which motivated his resignation. This also disproves MUTO's testimony that he did not know what transpired at the conference of the Big Three which came to the conclusion that no one in the army would accept the post of War Minister to succeed General HATA, transcript 33,230 to 33,231.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Lazarus.

MR. LAZARUS: Mr. President, I wish to object to this document on behalf of General HATA on several grounds. It would not, of course, be acceptable as rebuttal evidence under the grounds previously noted, but neither does it come under the two grounds now permitted by the Court. It has no probative value at all because it is nothing but excerpts from a newspaper, the Yomiuri Shimbun of 17 July 1940.

The Tribunal will well remember that while I was Chief Counsel in the China phase and we sought to

introduce evidence of this nature, the prosecution called them mere handouts, and the Tribunal sustained every objection, and in the end we withdrew every single document from newspapers.

Further, the Tribunal will note there is not a single direct quote nor is there anything that purports to be a quote or direct information from one of the persons attending these converences. There are three disjointed questions taken as excerpts from one newspaper article, with no source of authenticity shown of any nature.

One more point. This is in direct contradiction to prosecution's exhibit 532, which states definitely, because it is an excerpt from KIDO's Diary, and I quote from page 3 of that: "War Minister HATA met Prime Minister YONAI at 9:00 A. M. this morning and submitted his resignation."

How, then, could HATA have attended all these other conferences on the 16th?

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

Mr. English.

/24

MR. ENGLISH: We offer in evidence IPS document No. 3030-Q, an excerpt from the Minutes of the
Proceedings of the 75th Diet of 22 March 1940, marked
as exhibit 3021 for identification, to rebut the
accused MUTO's denial that in responsible circles
in Japan his speech in the Committee of Accounts
in the Diet of 20 March 1940 was interpreted as advocating the dissolution of political parties.

A foundation was laid on page 33,266 of the record.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: We object to the admission of this document on the basis that it is entirely unimportant and, if I may say so, seems to me quite pointless. This actually boils down merely to a question directed to General MUTO, and I can't see how under any circumstances a question directed to him could be impeachment. It shows that he replied for some one else, and the last sentence merely asks a further question. I can't see, if the Tribunal please, that this has any value for any purpose.

THE PRESIDENT: We want to be sure you have the right document in your hand. Mr. English skipped a document. You may have that one.

MR. COLE: May I beg the Court's indulgence.

for a moment? I don't have that corrected copy.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, have you the right document. IPS 3030-0, excerpts from a budget committee meeting?

MR. COLE: I have a corrected copy now. your Honor, which I have seen for the first time.

I offer the same objections with one further observation, the further observation being that testimony put in by the prosecution itself is contrary to the statement that General MUTO recommended the dissolution of political parties.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. English.

MR. ENGLISH: The accused MUTO in his affidavit attempted to explain this speech. The speech
was put in as an exhibit. He denied that he made the
statement that he was against the dissolution of political parties. The document is offered to show that he
did make the statement at the particular Diet committee
meeting.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. ENGLISH: That concludes order list No. 3.*
Commander Cole.

THE PRESIDENT: "Te will recess for fifteen minutes.

3

6

9

11

12

13

15

17

19

20

21

23

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

b

r

Y

1

2

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess

was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Commander Cole.

COMMANDER COLE: The prosecution now offers rebuttal documents on order list No. 4.

We first offer IPS document 2779, which was previously marked exhibit 3474 for identification at transcript page 33,469. This document is a Foreign Office memorandum dated 30 August 1938 relating to a conversation between the accused OKA and KAGESA. The document contradicts the testimony of the accused OKA, who stated on cross-examination at page 33,465 of the transcript that he did not remember a conversation with KAGESA, the Military Affairs Section Chief, on that date concerning the capture of Canton. OKA, in effect, denied that any such conversation could have taken place because, as he stated, such a matter as the capture of Canton would be outside the province of the Naval Affairs Bureau. Prosecution offers this document in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: The defense objects to this

document because it is a document the source of which is not disclosed and the nature of which is very vague and ambiguous so that it has no probative value and is not important. It purports by the certificate to be an agreement for the capture of Canton, but on its face it purports to be a record of a conversation between KAGESA and OKA; but that is also doubtful because I am informed that the opening two lines are mistranslated. It does not bear OKA's seal so that it cannot be relied upon as a report subscribed to by him for the purpose of impeaching his testimony. He denied it was an agreement or a report by him, which it isn't, and the closing sentence discloses it to be a mere conjecture concerning some possible action to be taken in these words: "No definite view has yet been decided upon; however, it is believed probable that either the Army and Navy Ministers will discuss the matter privately with the Foreign Minister or that it will be decided by the Five Ministers' Conference." I say it is very vague, very ambiguous, and has no probative value whatsoever.

COMMANDER COLE: If the Tribunal please, in regard to the alleged mistranslation of the first sentence of this document, the prosecution will submit that to the Language Arbitration Board and have the

7

10

5

6

7

8

12 13

> 14 15

> 16

17

19

21

22

document amended if that should prove necessary. In regard to the probative value of the document, this is an official memorandum of the Foreign Office, properly certified by the Chief of the Archives Section thereof.

THE PRESIDENT: We would like a translation immediately of the words which are questioned.

COMMANDER COLE: Will the Language Section translate the first sentence of this document?

Prosecution would also like to point out that the Foreign Office properly kept an official record of this conversation since, as it is stated in the document in paragraph 3, the capture of Canton was deeply connected with diplomatic considerations.

MR. ROBERTS: The Tribunal should bear in mind that the two men who are mentioned in the document are chiefs of sections. One is a Chief of a Section in the Naval Affairs Bureau and the other is a Chief of a Section in the Military Affairs Bureau. How these two Chiefs of Sections could sign an agreement for the capture of Canton is inconceivable.

THE PRESIDENT: Independently of this document, perhaps. We must have the translation before
we can give our decision. Have you another document
you could offer while we are waiting for the translation?

COMMANDER COLE: Yes, your Honor. I believe he has the translation now.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Mr. Sano): If the Tribunal please, we submit the following language correction: "The statement of KAGESA and OKA, Chiefs of Military and Naval Affairs Sections, is as follows."

MR. ROBERTS: And I again remind the Tribunal that this document does not bear the seal of OKA. He said he never recalled seeing it before so its probative value is nil. As a matter of fact, it has no importance whatever.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 2779, now exhibit 3474 for identification only, will be marked as received in evidence and will retain the same exhibit number.

(Whereupon, exhibit No. 3474, previously marked for identification, was received in evidence.)

COMMANDER COLE: This document is dated

30 August 1938 and marked "Top Secret." It is

stamped in the margin and initialed by the following:

"Chief of East Asia Bureau; Chief of First Section,

3

6

9

10

12

13

15

16

ι7

19

20

22

24

East Asia Bureau; Minister; Vice Minister." The document reads as follows:

"The statement of KAGESA and OKA, Military
Affairs Section Chief and Naval Affairs Section Chief,
is as follows:

"I. Actual conferences on concrete plans for the capture of Canton, between the Army and Navy have been in progress for the past two or three days. The Army strength is expected to be about 3 divisions.

"II. In consideration of the friction with Britain, the land forces will land on the peninsula at the East part of Bias Bay and will carry out the capture of Canton.

"III. The capture of Canton is deeply connected with diplomatic considerations; therefore it is thought by some that the policy should be decided by the Five Ministers' Conference. However, the Five Ministers' Conferences has already from time to time, in accordance with the transition of the war situation, decided the policies of occupying various important places in China, and the capture of Canton is nothing but the application of the said over-all policy. Moreover, as the Canton operation is an action lying purely and simply within the Supreme Command sphere, a decision to leave the formal

2

4 5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

decision of policy to the Five Ministers' Conference might give rise to the charge that the prerogative of the Supreme Command had been violated. No definite view has yet been decided upon; however, it is believed probable that either the Army and Navy Ministers will discuss the matter privately with the Foreign Minister or that it will be decided by the Five Ministers' Conference."

Next, IPS document 3249, which was previously marked exhibit 3475-A for identification at transcript page 33,486, is offered. It is an article from the Asahi Shimbun dated 26 March 1941 relating to joint Army and Navy plan for the reorganization of the IRAA. The accused OKA stated on cross-examination at page 33,476 of the transcript that he had absolutely no recollection that he and MUTO, in March, 1941, prepared such a joint plan for reorganization of the IRAA. OKA also denied, at page 33,477 of the transcript, that the Naval Affairs Bureau engaged in positive activities with reference to the IRAA.

The evidence previously given before this
Tribunal, particularly the testimony appearing at
transcript page 1079, shows that after January, 1941
all newspapers were organized into the Japanese Newspaper League which resulted in complete governmental
control of all information channels. Likewise, the
establishment of the Board of Information at about the
same date resulted in strict censorship control. In
view of this fact the prosecution submits that the present newspaper article, which concerns official action
taken by the Army and Navy, could not have been published without the consent and approval of the Army
and Navy. Consequently, this newspaper article is,

3 4

in effect, the report of an official announcement and should be admitted in evidence.

Prosecution wishes to point out that as recently as 17 December, 1947 the defense offered and the Court received in evidence, at transcript page 35,600, an article from the Asahi Shimbun to show the date of the Japanese withdrawal from the League of Nations. The prosecution submits that the same rule should be applied to the newspaper article now offered.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.

article, and the defense claims it does not disclose the source of the information contained therein and is of no probative value. Under previous rulings of this Court such newspaper articles have been rejected whether offered by the prosecution or the defense.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

the next two documents are also newspaper articles.

Wherever a document was shown to the accused on cross-examination and marked for identification, the prosecution has felt that as a matter of good faith it should tender the document in evidence at this time.

However, in view of the Court's rejection of the last

2 3

document, prosecution will omit the next two docu-

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

COMMANDER COLE: We next offer IPS document 1087. This document was the official record of the Privy Council meeting of 8 December, 1941 concerning the decision to declare war. The document is offered in evidence in contradiction of the testimony of the accused OKA who stated on cross-examination, at page 33,503 of the transcript, that he did not recall attending a meeting of the Privy Council on that date but that, if he did attend, he did not participate in the decision.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.

well. Why this document is being offered in rebuttal is not clear to counsel. When cross-examined concernithis meeting, at page 33,502 of the record, the accused OKA stated that he probably attended such meeting as an explainer. In view of the submission of the accused, the document is not important and will only add to the mass of documents already presented.

COMMANDER COLE: If it please the Tribunal, the accused OKA, at transcript page 33,502, stated

that he did not recall attending the Privy Council.

His final explanation on the next page, 33,503, was that there was no case of his participating in the decision, and he did not recall whether he attended or not. On direct examination the accused OKA cited a number of prosecution exhibits relating to meetings of the Investigation Committee of the Privy Council, in all of which he stated that he retired from the conference before the decision was reached. The present document involving a Privy Council meeting shows that OKA did not retire from the conference and was present at the time the decision was unanimously reached.

THE PRESIDENT: At least it does not disclose the contrary; that is as much as you can say.

COMMANDER COLE: In view of the fact that it was this Privy Council which decided on war with the United States, prosecution submits that the document has probative value and should be admitted.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

COMMANDER COLE: We next offer IPS document
No. 3267 which was previously marked exhibit 3477
for identification at page 33,517. This document is
a directive from the Chief of the Naval Affairs Bureau

3 4

7 8

of the Navy Ministry to the Chief of the Military
Affairs Bureau of the War Ministry and the Chief of
the Army Prisoner of War Control Department, dated
30 November 1943, concerning a transfer of thirtyeight prisoners of war from Ofuna Prisoner of War
Camp to the Army. The accused OKA stated on crossexamination, at page 33,507, that he had absolutely
no recollection of having ordered the transfer of
such prisoners of war from Ofuna Prisoner of War
Camp to the Army. OKA also denied that this document was an order and stated that it was only an
inquiry in connection with liaison work, transcript
page 33,508. Prosecution offers this document in
evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: Objection is made to this document because this is a document which the accused OKA stated is an inquiry concerning the transfer of prisoners of war handled as a liaison matter by the Naval Affairs Bureau. Its examination will show that it states, "Communication re Delivery of POW's," and it does not in any manner act to impeach the testimony of the accused and is not important for any purpose except possibly to further clutter up the record in this case.

3 4 5

7 8

As the accused stated on page 33, 508 of the record, "This is not an order. This, as I have already referred to, is one of the items requiring liaison work." It merely shows that the Naval Affairs Bureau handled the transfer of prisoners of war and no one has ever denied this.

7 8

. 24

Whalen & Knapp

examination the accused OKA, transcript page 33,505, stated that the highest authority in connection with the supervision of prisoners of war was commanders of naval stations, fleets, and naval guard areas. The accused OKA also, transcript page 33,569, stated that he had no recollection of the Naval Affairs Bureau issuing orders concerning prisoners of war.

The prosecution submits that this document, which is an official record of the Prisoners of War Information Bureau, relates to a material fact placed in issue by the accused OKA himself.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

Commander Cole, in view of our decision that unimportant documents will not be received, you are not bound to tender any document of that nature merely to show your good faith.

view of that I will omit the last document on the order list.

This concludes the presentation of documents on order list No. 4. Mr. Comyns Carr will continue.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal,

13

11

14

16

18

19

21

23

24

in the course of the defense case a number of witnesses have been cross-examined on the basis of what is known as the MARADA-SAIONJI records and have made statements under cross-examination or in their direct evidence which are in whole or in part contrary to entries in those volumes. We propose to tender together and in order of date, with one exception, all the extracts of those records on which we rely. A full copy of the translation prepared by the Civil Intelligence Section of SCAP has been deposited with the Clerk of the Tribunal and been available for inspection by the defense ever since the 29th of August, 1947, and as from that date the defense has had access to the photostatic copy of the Japanese. That they have made full use of these is clear from the fact that occasionally when we have based questions upon parts of these records, objection has been taken on the ground of alleged inaccuracies in the translation. For this reason we have had the translation of all the excerpts which we are using revised and in every case the excerpt which will be tendered now is in revised translation. If the defense are still not satisfied with any part of it it can, of course, be referred to the Language Arbitration Board.

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The defense of UMEZU has itself made use of

these records, putting in an excerpt which is now exhibit 3693 at page 36,883 of the record. Other defense counsel, although having full opportunity to do the same, have preferred to make no reference to it.

Two of the accused, KIDO and TOJO, have attacked the reliability of the late Baron HARADA, KIDO at page 31,540 and TOJO at pages 36,656-60, with special regard to an excerpt of 19 August 1940 which was marked for identification as exhibit 3687 at page 36,665.

KIDO's allegations were that HARADA was not a scholar and lacking in method, that he had a long illness of three or four months from February 1937 onwards, during which KIDO had to do his work for him and from some unspecified date in the later part of his life he was given to drowsiness and did not appear to be listening to what was said to him.

TOJO's allegation was that exhibit 3687, which purports among other things to quote from a record of a Four Ministers' Conference on or about that date, was a concoction. In order to refute these allegations we shall first call before you Mrs. KONOYE, the sister-in-law of the late Prince KONOYE, who took the whole of these records from beginning to end from the dictation of HARADA, seeing him once or twice a week for that purpose. We shall also call Dr. Tomiji MURAYAMA who

medically attended Baron HARADA throughout the period concerned.

DIRECT

I think it will be more convenient to call Dr. MURAYAMA first because he will be quite short and enable him to be dispensed with. I therefore call Dr. MURAYAMA.

THE PRESIDENT: The Marshal has not been informed that witnesses are to be called until just now. MARSHAL OF THE COURT: I have dispatched some-

one to find out where they are.

MR. COMYNS CARR: They are in attendance. Here he is.

TOMIJI MURAYAMA, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COMYNS CARR:

Are you Tomiji MURAYAMA, a physician in Tokyo?

> Yes. A

MR. COMYNS CARR: May he be shown IPS document No. 3358?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

> 20 21

22 23

24

L

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Is that your affidavit? Yes, it is. A Are the contents thereof true? They are. MR. COMYNS CARR: I tender it in evidence. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan. MR. LOGAN: If it please the Tribunal, I have been trying cases for high onto twenty years and this is the first instance that I know of where the proponent of a document is in such doubt of it that he must produce a doctor to show that the person who wrote the document was sound mentally. THE PRESIDENT: It is the defense that has the doubts, not the prosecution, if I understand correctly. MR. LOGAN: There has been no evidence in this case by any of the accused that I know of questioning the mentality of Baron HARADA. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr read a number of observations from which that deduction might be drawn. MR. LOGAN: None of the observations read by him stated that his mentality was impaired. We object to the introducing of this document. THE PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled and

the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3358

will receive exhibit No. 3749.

("hereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3749 and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARK: I will now read it.

"I, Tomiji MURAYAMA, a physician in Tokyo, Japan, was family or house physician for the late Baron Kumao HakaDA from 1922 until his death in 1946.

"During the period from 1922 until 1941 I attended the late Baron HARADA during several illnesses, none of which were serious, and at no time was there a loss of memory or any sickenss which would impair his mentality.

"During the period 1930 until 1941 the late Baron HARADA was in complete command of all his faculties and was alert mentally."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY Mr. LOGAN:

Doctor, did you continue to treat Baron HARADA after 1941?

I was his principal physician until the date of his death.

What ilinesses did he have after 1941? THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr. MR. COMYNS CARR: I object to that question, your Honor. In our submission this is immaterial. The

10

12

13

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

37,448

affidavit is confined to the period 1941 because the record ceased to be kept at the end of 1940, and anything that happened after that time is immaterial.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, that question is admissible on two grounds. If Baron HARADA suffered from any illness after 1941 which affected his memory at all it might be traced back to a period of time during which he was dictating these memoirs. Secondly, it will be shown that corrections were made to his memoirs after 1941 and that he was not able to read them at that time because of his illness and look them over to see if the corrections were accurate.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, are you trying to associate some mental condition after 1941 with his mental condition in 1941?

MR. LOGAN: Yes, and prior thereto.

THE PRESIDENT: You may ask the question.

- Q Will you answer the question?
- A In August 1943 Baron HARADA was affected by thrombos's of the brain.
- Q Is that a disease that comes on suddenly, Doctor, or does it come on gradually?
 - A It is relatively acute.
- Q And how long had he been suffering with that prior to 1943?

3

7

9

10

11

13

15

16

18

20

21

22

24

affidavit is confined to the period 1941 because the record ceased to be kept at the end of 1940, and anything that happened after that time is immaterial.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, that question is admissible on two grounds. If Baron HARADA suffered from any illness after 1941 which affected his memory at all it might be traced back to a period of time during which he was dictating these memoirs. Secondly, it will be shown that corrections were made to his memoirs after 1941 and that he was not able to read them at that time because of his illness and look them over to see if the corrections were accurate.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, are you trying to associate some mental condition after 1941 with his mental condition in 1941?

MR. LOGAN: Yes, and prior thereto.

THE PRESIDENT: You may ask the question.

Q Will you answer the question?

A In August 1943 Baron HARADA was affected by thrombos's of the brain.

Q Is that a disease that comes on suddenly, Doctor, or does it come on gradually?

A It is relatively acute.

Q And how long had he been suffering with that prior to 1943?

3

6

8

10

11

12

14

16

17

19

20

21

22

2

3

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

He was affected by this disease for the first time in August 1943. How many times did you attend him in your capacity as a physician from 1922 until 1941? As my records were destroyed during the air raids I shall have to testify from memory. But I recall that during 1922 I attended him two or three times. What was the illness from which he was suffering at that time? I believe they were of such nature as colds or indigestion coming from overeating. And that was just one year, 1922. But how many times did you attend him from 1922 to 1941? From 1929 to 1941? Q 1922 to 1941. A Several times in that period. How many times is "several times", Doctor? Q In Japan, five or six times. Is that five or six times a year or five or six times during this entire period from 1922 to 1941? Five or six times throughout the whole period. A

A

No.

sician.

Q

Q What were the years in which you treated him?

Did he have any other doctors?

And you said that you were his principal phy-

24

I am sorry, I do not have the records so I cannot give you the exact years. What is your best recollection of it now? Throughout that period he never contracted any disease important enough to call by name. I didn't ask you that, Doctor. I asked you what years you saw him in, those five or six times, from 1922 to 1941, to the best of your recollection? I can't tell you because it is not in my recollection. Q So that you only saw him five or six times from 1922 to 1941, is that your testimony? Yes. And yet you are trying to tell this Tribunal that during this --THE INTERPRETER: Was the word "saw" or "treated"? (Whereupon, the official court

read as follows: "So that you only saw him -- ") I have seen him on other occasions because I treated other members of his family for diseases. But

I only treated him five or six times.

How many times did you see him during that period of time aside from your treating him for any illnesses?

23 24

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

A I had opportunities to see him two or three times a month.

Q Loctor, what causes thrombosis of the brain?

A He was a little too obese and therefore his heart was weakened, and his thrombosis came from that.

Q How long did he suffer with a bed heart?

A He showed signs of a weakened heart from the year previous to the outbreak of this disease.

Q Did he ever tell you about the headaches he started getting in 1937?

A I never heard of any headaches.

Q Did you know he was so ill in 1937 that he had to get Marquis KIDO to take over his work for about five months as secretary to Prince SAIONJI?

A I have never seen him affected by any disease covering such an extensive period as five months.

Q I didn't ask you that, Doctor. I said did you know that during that period of time he had to get Marquis KIDO to take over his work as secretary for Prince SaIONJI?

A I do not know.

Q Did you visit him during that period of time?

A I may have, but it is not in my recollection.

Q When did he first suffer with paralysis, Doctor?

A That was after he contracted thrombosis of

3 4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

14

16 17

18

20

21

23 24

the brain.

Q Are you sure he contracted thrombosis in 1943? Are you sure that is the year without your notes?

A I am sure.

Q And as a result of this paralysis he was unable to speak for quite a period of time, isn't that so, Doctor?

A That is true. For about a month after he contracted thrombosis of the brain he was not able to use his tongue, and even after that, up to the date of his death, he was not able to use his tongue freely. Correction: It was difficult to understand what he was saying.

Q How often did Beron HARADA used to stay down at Oiso?

A I think that he made his home in Oiso after he contracted this disease up to the date of his death. Once in a while, when his disease was not too heavy, he would go to Hakone for recuperation. But I do not know how long he lived in Oiso before contracting this disease.

Q Didn't he used to go to Karuizawa for long periods of time, too?

A He went to Karuizawa the year he contracted

>

8

11

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

this disease, and in fact he became sick while on the train going from Karuizawa to Oiso near Shimbashi Station.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half past one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

,

D u & S

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MURAYAMA, called as a witness TOMIJI on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. LOGAN (Continued):

Doctor, in what branch of medicine do you Q specialize?

Diseases of the heart, kidneys, and of the digestive organs, and metabolism.

You don't specialize in mental diseases, do you?

No. A

How old are you? Q

I am fifty-five, according to the Japanese A count.

Doctor, when you were called in by the

23 24

6

7

9 10

11

12

13 14

16 17

15

19

20

21

18

22 23

prosecution to give an afficavit, did you make the suggestion with respect to loss of memory or lack of it of Baron HARADA, or did you answer that pursuant to a question that was put to you by the prosecution?

I made the statement of my own free will pursuant and in answer to a question.

In other words, they brought the question up first; is that it?

Yes, they put the emostion.

Q Does paralysis affect the memory, Doctor?

In some cases, yes; in other cases, no. A

And of course if you had never examined a person, and if he had paralysis or semi-paralysis you couldn't tell whether or not his memory was affected; isn't that right?

Of course it depends on circumstances.

Q Well, you don't mean to tell me, Doctor, that you could make a diagnosis with respect to a person's memory without examining the person, could you?

Well, I think a doctor's knowledge would be sufficient to cover that.

Without such an examination; is that right?

In examining brain disease, loss of memory and the state of mentality would be taken into account.

24

Q But you would have to make tests on a person to determine that, wouldn't you?

A In some cases the tests are required.

Q Did you make any tests of HARADA with respect to his memory?

A I have, in 1943, after he became ill.

Q But you never made any before that; is that right?

A Not especially.

Q So your statement in this affidavit that at no time was there a loss of memory or any sickness that would impair his mentality from 1922 to 1941 is a gratuitous statement on your part without any medical background; isn't that right?

And you only made that statement because the prosecution asked you to; isn't that so?

THE PRESIDENT: You did not listen for the reply, Mr. Logan. I did not hear one. I heard him say something in Japanese, which meant nothing to me.

MR. LOGAN: I was finishing the question, if your Honor please.

THE MONITOR: At that time the witness was able to go only so far as to say "special examination," and the rest was not audible to us.

Q Well, enswer the question, Doctor.

\$

12

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15 16

> 17 18

19

21

22 23 24

A He never contracted any disease requiring a special examination, and throughout the period of my association with him he never showed any signs of loss of memory or of an impaired mentality.

Q Is paralysis or semi-paralysis caused by a blood clot, Doctor?

A Yes.

Q Are you sure, Doctor, you never treated Baron HARADA in 1937 for paralysis -- paralytic condition?

A I never have, I am sure.

Q And a blood clot on the brain causes pressure and is quite probably likely to affect the memory; isn't that so?

A It does.

Q Now, Doctor, with respect to your testimony, if there appears in Marquis KIDO's Diary of February 27, 1937, the following statement:

"At half-past eight HARADA called at my home. I was greatly surprised to learn that he was suffering from nervous prostration; that the left half of his body was semi-paralyzed. I advised him urgently to recuperate."

Now, in view of that statement that appears in that diary, are you still willing to tell this

6

7

9

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

22

24

Court that Baron HARADA suffered no illness, did not have paralysis in 1937, did not have nervous prostration?

A I have no recollection of what Baron HARADA may have told me.

THE MONITOR: Correction: I have no collection of HARADA ever telling me about that.

- Q Is it possible that he did tell you?
- A It is not in my recollection.
- Q But you were his only physician. Wouldn't he have told you that if he had had it?
 - A I think so.
- Q And not having told you that, assuming that he had it, I presume that you are willing to state that he might have had other mental troubles during that period of time which he didn't tell you about; isn't that so?

A I do not know of his having suffered from any mental disease.

2

4

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

Q Doctor, you con't presume to tell us that y u remember every illness of every one of your patients that you treated from 1922 to 1941, do you; especially since all your records are burned?

A Certainly not. But as for Baron HARADA, I was on especially intimate terms with him, and so I remember his case better than the others -- I should remember his case better than the others.

Q You were more intimate with him than with any of your other patients, I prenume, for the purpose of this trial, isn't that so, Doctor?

A He was one of my patients with whom I was most intimate.

Q How many patients did you have from 1922 to 1945?

THE PRESIDENT: I am sure we do not want to

Assuming, Doctor, that Baron HARADA did have a semi-paralytic stroke in 1937, and in view of the fact that you treated him in 1943, would you say that that stroke that he had in '37 was the result of a blood clot on the brain, too?

A I think that the thrombosis of the brain was first contracted by Baron HARADA in 1943.

Q But he may have had it before, isn't that so,

3

7

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

22

23

2/

Doctor?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

If he had been, he should have shown some symptoms. But when I examined him in 1943, I saw no such symptoms of a prior outbreak.

MR. LOGAN: That is all.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

REDIRECT -EXAMINATION

BY MR. COMYNS CARR:

In view of the questions that have been asked, Doctor, I would like to ask you, where did you take your medical qualification?

A I graduated from the Okayama Medical College in Japan, and later I continued my studies at the University of Pennsylvania and at Harvard University in America.

MR. COMYNS CARR: That is all I ask. May the witness be released?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused on the usual

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.) MR. COMYNS CARR: Now I call Mrs. Yasuko

KONOYE. 23

terms.

24

2

YASUKO KONOYE, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

LIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COMYNS CARR:

Q Is your name Yasuko KONOYE; are you the wife of Hidemaro KONOYE, the younger brother of the late Prince KONOYE?

A I am.

Q And are you a teacher of shorthand?

A Yes.

MR. COMYNS CARR: There are two affidavits of this witness, and I ask that they both be shown to her together, documents 3357-A and B.

(Whereupon, documents were handed to the witness.)

Q Are those your afficavits, and are the contents of them true?

A They are all true.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I tender them both in evidence, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document

3357-A will receive exhibit No. 3750. Prosecution

X

9

5

7

1

10

12

13 14

15 16

> 17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24

2

document 3357-B will receive exhibit No. 3750-A.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked prosecution exhibits No. 3750 and 3750-A, respectively, and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARR: I will read them it that order.

"I, Yasuko KONOYE, wife of Hidemaro KONOYE, am a teacher of shorthand, and during the period of 1930 to 19, I, as his stenographer, took in shorthand the notes of the late Paron Kumao HARADA.

"I have been shown by Mr. J. G. Lambert, IPS
Investigator, a photostatic copy of this 'nished
transcription which I recognize as the memoirs of
Baron HARADA written by me in my own handwriting.

"These notes taken by me in shorthand were transcribed in Japanese by me and given to Baron HARADA for approval.

"Baron HARADA took the transcription to Prince Kimmochi SAIONJI for corrections and suggestions.

"Princé SAIONJI's corrections and/or suggestions were incorporated in the completed form which I wrote in my own handwriting and which is identified as above."

Your Honor, the prosecution number of the

6

8

10

12

13

15

16

18

19

21

22

23

24

document, the volumes as a whole, is 3150. My friend, Mr. Logan, has agreed to dispense with their all being brought into court to be marked for identification, owing to the great bulk of them, but I ask that they be given an exhibit number as marked for identification.

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 &

CLERK OF THE COURT: The HARADA-SAIONJI Memoirs will receive exhibit No. 3751 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3751 for identification.)

MR. COMYNS CARR: I now read exhibit No. 3750-A:

"Baron Kumao HARADA dictated to me, Yasuko KONOYE, once or twice a week from notes and from memory the first drafts of the record.

"Baron HARADA was a university graduate and was about average in methodical methods of work, being neither outstanding nor lax in the organizing of his work.

"With reference to a statement made by Koichi KIDO that Baron HARADA was sick for three or four months from the time when UGAKI failed to form his Cabinet (i.e., the end of January, 1937) and that KIDO took over his duties, I say as follows:

"(a) From a study of the records of the period 1 February 1937 - 31 May 1937 there was only one sickness mertioned, this being on 23 February and he was active on 3 March having gone to Okitsu on that date. During the whole of the rest of the four months

19 20

21

22 23

he was travelling between Tokyo, his own and Prince SAIONJI's country homes, and calling upon people.

"(b) During such times as he was sick, either in this or any other period, he never ceased dictating the records. I took the dictation in his bedroom or sitting-room. During such a period he gathered information by telephone calls and by people visiting him. At no time did KTDO or anyone other than HARADA dictate any part of the records.

"With regard to KIDO's statement that HARADA suffered from drowsiness during the latter part of his life, I say that if this refers to the five years between the death of SAIONJI (when he ceased dictating the records) and his own, I saw him very seldom and cannot express an opinion. But it is not true as to any part of the time when he was keeping the records. It is true that all the time, whatever his state of health, he occasionally appeared abstracted, as if he was thinking of something else, while someone was speaking; but I noticed that in spite of this appearance, he always knew quite well what they said. He was, at all times, while I knew him, fully competent mentally.

"With regard to the entry of 19 August 1940, marked for identification during the cross-examination of the accused TOJO as exhibit 3687, I well remember

1.

that when HARADA was dictating this to me he was reading from a document which he held in his hand."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. LOGAN:

Q Mrs. KONOYE, you state in your affidavit that you used to take this dictation from Baron HARADA once or twice a week. When did you first start taking dictation of these Memoirs from Baron HARADA?

A From 1930.

Q Now, isn't it a fact, Mrs. KONOYE, that on some occasions, that is, many occasions, you didn't take this dictation but once every two weeks, sometimes once every three weeks?

A There were such occasions, but when there was little to write, sometimes in one sitting I would take down what should have been put down as two separate dates, and therefore the dates of the Diary may not be accurate in all respects -- in all cases.

Q It may not be accurate in all cases. Now, in what other cases besides the date might it be inaccurate?

A I don't feel that there are any other inaccuracies besides the date.

Q Well, what did you mean by inaccuracies in all cases?

3

5

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

22

24

25

THE MONITOR: Japanese court reporter.

(Whereupon, the Japanese court reporter read.)

THE MONITOR: Perhaps we had better make a correction on the answer by the witness, next to the last one -- before the last one: "It may be well said that the dates of the Diary are not altogether correct," instead of, "in all cases."

Q Well, getting back to that, Mrs. KONOYE, I will withdraw the last question.

Let's take this Part 14, for example, which the prosecution filed in the Clerk's office, of the so-called SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs. On page 2011 there is a chapter headed 9 of February 1938, but the first entry under that date starts off, "On January 21." Does that mean, Mrs. KONOYE, that on the 9th of February Baron HARADA sat down and started to dictate what happened on January 21?

if my friend had intended to ask her about particular entries of the Diary, he should have spoken for the Japanese copies of those so that they would be here to be shown to her, and I ask that these copies be sent for before she answers.

THE PRESIDENT: If she has no independent

2

4 5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

16

18

19

21

22

23

recollection, she may refer to them, but she hasn't asked for that yet.

MR. LOGAN: The prosecution is anticipating something that isn't going to happen. I am not going to ask her for the contents of them. I am just talking about the date when she took this dictation and when it was written.

IR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, it might be equally difficult for such questions to be answered without seeing the record.

BY MR. LOGAN (Continued):

You can answer that question, can't you, Mrs. KONOYE?

A Unless I be shown the contents, I can't make any reply.

IR. LOGAN: I think the remarks suggested that answer. I wish these interruptions wouldn't occur.

May I ask the prosecution to bring into court, since it now becomes necessary, that particular photostatic copy so that we can show it to the witness, and I'd also like to have the prosecution produce the original.

THE PRESIDENT: Let us avoid that if we can.

They were too big to bring into court for identification purposes.

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

IR. LOGAN: Well, any volume they bring in, if the Tribunal please, I'll examine her on that.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Of course, if we had had notice of this, we would have had them in court, but my friend told me it could be dispensed with, bringing them into court.

MR. LOGAN: If the objection hadn't been made the way it was, too, it wouldn't have been necessary to bring them in.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mh. COMYNS CARR: I am sure it would.

Your Honor, the Japanese copies are not arranged, I understand, in the parts in which the English copies are. If my friend will tell me the chapter number he wants, we can get it.

MR. LOGAN: 262. I would also like to have chapter 264 and chapter 266.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, while they are bringing those in, I would like to have the first volume and the last volume of the original from which the photostatic copy has been made to be shown to the witness so we can examine her on it.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, the original is not in our possession. BY MR. LOGAN (Continued):

Now, Mrs. KONOYE, we will go on to another subject pending the receipt of those books.

How long did you continue to take dictation from Baron HARADA?

From 1930 to the date of Prince SAIONJI's death.

Q. And when was that?

Winter 1940, I think. A

And how many times during those ten years would you say that you took dictation; once or twice

a week?

A Since it was so long ago, I don't distinctly remember.

Q Now, you said something a little while ago that when you let about three weeks elapse before appearing to take dictation from Baron HARADA that you put in _everal dates. Now, just what did you mean by that?

A According to my recollection, when there was little to write the number of pages was also naturally small and therefore what would ordinarily require two or three dictations would be bound in one volume.

THE MONITOR: "What would ordinarily take two or three dictations on separate occasions, would be incorporated into only one dictation."

Q So that can we assume or state, Mrs. KONOYE, that the regularity of your visits to Baron HARADA depended upon the amount of material that he had to dictate?

A I think there were considerations of Baron HARADA's health also involved.

Q Wasn't he feeling well?

A Sometimes he would catch cold or be otherwise indisposed.

6

9

8

10

12

13 14

> 15 16

> > 17 18

19

20

21

23

24

Q Well, passing that for the moment, Mrs. KONOYE, on these visits where a space of three weeks or less elapsed, we understand that Baron HARADA would dictate to you what happened three weeks previously.

A In cases where three weeks elapsed between one sitting and the next you may think so.

Q He dictated from memory and notes you say in your affidavit; is that true?

A That is correct.

Q And the notes he used were obtained by him from his diaries; isn't that correct?

A On the whole, yes -- on the whole, I think so.

Q And in these diaries, Mrs. KONOYE, isn't it a fact that Baron HARADA recorded, for example, a dinner he went to, who was there and the topic of the conversation and that was practically all that he would have with respect to that particular entry? Isn't that so?

A I hope you will investigate the contents because I do not know very much about them.

MR. LOGAN: I ask that the witness be shown this book.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

3

6

8

9

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

21

22

24

Q Do you recognize that as one of Baron HAHADA's original diaries?

A This writing looks to me like that of Baron HARADA.

Q Assuming it is Baron HARADA's, don't you find in that book that practically all instances where he had meetings with people he merely records the names of the people and the gist of the conversation, and in very few instances does he record what anyone said?

A I can observe -- it may be observed that on subjects other than persons' names, HARADA dictated to me from memory.

Q Then his dictation primarily didn't come from diaries such as the one you have in your hand, except that the diary refreshed his recollection as to who was present and to whom he talked; isn't that so, Mrs. KONOYE?

A There were many occasions when Baron HARADA dictated to me from memory and not from this diary, but even in this diary I am sure you will find many items -- many notations of events as distinguished from names of persons.

Q Did you find many instances of actual complete conversations in that book such as he dictated to you

4

7

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

19

21

23

from memory?

There are several places in this notebook -there are places here and there where conversations are recorded, but whole conversations are not recorded and it is more or less something more; notes to which comments have been added.

THE INTERPRETER: "It was something like notes to which comments had been added."

In other words, Mrs. KONOYE, can we state as a fact that the conversations which he dictated to you did not come from any notes?

- I couldn't say that all were.
- Would you say the majority of cases are so? Q
- In regard to specific details, I think he dictated to me from memory. There were also occasions on which he had papers in his hand other than this notebook from which he would dictate to me.
- Q How many occasions during this ten-year period would you say he had some documents, other than those notebooks, similar to that?

I am afraid I can hardly remember such specific instances.

23

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

KONOYE

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q	"fould	it be	one	or	two	or	a	great	many	cases?	
*	100000000000000000000000000000000000000										

- All the time -- on many occasions.
- "hat type of documents were they?

They were pieces of paper on which notations somewhat simpler than those given in this notebook were written down -- for instance, dates, names of people, and the broad outline of events or matters under discussion.

They did not contain conversations, did they, that he had with other people, that is, in quotation marks?

I have never seen those papers. A

So you don't know what was in them at all, do you? You are just guessing, isn't that so?

I was able to tell by the way in which he read them.

Did he ever read any documents to you in which he was quoting conversations that he had with other people?

May I have that statement repeated? (Whereupon, the last question was read.)

(Continuing) Maybe, but I don't recall for sure.

You took the dictation home and wrote it out

in Japanese script, isn't that correct, Mrs. KONOYE?

A That is so.

O So that if there were two three-week periods together, it would mean that when you took them back to Baron HARADA written out in your script, a period of six weeks had elapsed, isn't that so?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honors, I haven't heard her say anything about two three-week periods being together at any time. My friend is putting that into her mouth as though she had said it.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, I have no objection to the prosecutor making legal objections, but when he suggests answers to the witness, then I think it is time to stop. This is cross-examination. I suggest, if the Tribunal please, that we be permitted the same lattitude that the prosecution was given.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor --

MR. LOGAN: If he has any legal objection to the question I have no objection to him stating it.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, that was a legal objection. In my submission a question so phrased as to assume that the witness has said something which she has not said is an improper question, and legal objection may be taken to it.

9

.11

9

10

1

13 14

12

15

16

18

19

21

22

THE PRESIDENT: Such a question of course is objectionable. The question now is, What did she say? MR. LOGAN: Is the objection sustained, your 4 Honor? 5 THE PRESIDENT: What did she say? Did she say what you suggested to her she said? Do you debate that? 10 11 12 13 37,407 14 15 THE EXPLANE A THEN A CHARLEST OF POSTERS AS 16 decidential the built prairie, "But the state south 17 18 is the orie of a sust drad, your 19 20 - of the course of the total of the said the ax of three execution has a series 21 22 She to Min. 14 23 24

MR. LOGAN: If the court reporter will read back the question. I am not sure but I think I put it in a supposititious way.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that is wrong.

The objection is allowed in those circumstances and the question disallowed. The question must be based on what she actually said. It purported to be based on what she said.

Q Mrs. KONOYE, you testified that you did not know how many times during that ten year period you went to see Earon HARADA and take dictation once or twice a week, is that correct?

A I don't recall.

Q I also assume on the basis of elimination you don't know how many times you went once every three weeks or so, is that correct?

A You may.

Q How many times, if any, during those ten years did you go once every three weeks in succession?

A I don't remember that either.

Q Were there ever any such occasions?

A I believe there were occasions when I didn't go for three weeks when Baron HARADA was ill or indisposed.

Q Were there occasions when you didn't for three

3

5 6

4

7 8

9

11

13

15 16

17

19

18

20

23

22

24

25

v eks twice or three times in succession one after the other?

I feel that there were but on the whole I went to see him ones or twice a week.

So that on these occasions that you think did happen, three weeks elapsed twice in succession, when you brought the document back to Baron HARADA it was, therefore, six weeks after the first date mentioned in your transcript of your proceedings, is that not so?

- I think you can say that.
- After you brought the record, the memeirs, back to Baron HARADA he would keep them for a while, wouldn't he, and then take them up to Prince SAIONJI later on?

I could not say. I would not be able to tell À you anything about that. My recollection is that he took them with him on the next occasion he visited Okitsu.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:) ,

25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

е n b

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is no: resumed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please.

BY MR. LOGAN (Continued):

In any event, Mrs. KONOYE, you do know it to be a fact that the Memoirs were taken, after you wrote them in Japanese script, given to Baron HARADA and he did take them up to have Prince SAIONJI edit them; isn't that se?

That is so.

And did Baron HARADA bring those manuscripts back with him on the same trip to see Prince SAIONJI or did he wait and pick them up at a subsequent date?

A Since I didn't see him doing this on each occasion I cannot say anything. I don't know.

In any event Baron HARADA would give them to you after he had been up to see Frince SAIONJI; isn't that so?

Those records were kept by Baron HARADA's family.

Now, Mrs. KONOYE, isn't it a fact that after Baron HARADA had gone up to see Prince SAIONJI, he brought them back and he turned them over to you to have them rewritten; isn't that true?

0

19 20

21

22

23

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

A That was quite some time afterwards I rewrote the whole thing over again.

Addition: There was an occasion when I rewrote them, when I rewrote the whole thing over, after a considerable period of time had elapsed.

Q When did you start rewriting these Memoirs, Mrs. KONOYE?

A I don't remember. Frankly speaking, I must tell you that my sense of time is very hazy and I often confuse what happened yesterday with what happened the day before.

Q In other words, you admit you do not have a good memory?

A Yes.

Q Well, see if you can answer this question,
Mrs. KONOYE. When you started rewriting these Memoirs,
were there any deletions or additions to the documents
as you got them back as compared to your original submission to Baron HARADA?

A I recall that there were some insertions in Prince SAIONJI's handwriting.

Q Were there many?

A I think there were very few.

Q How many documents, how many years of these documents, did you rewrite?

KONOYE

About a third of the whole series from the beginning to the end.

And how many deletions were there? Were there many or few?

5

My recollection is that there were hardly any.

6

You are familiar with Prince SAIONJI's hand-

writing?

On the whole I feel I can recognize it. . A

8

And you don't know when Prince SAIONJI made the changes in these documents, do you?

10 11

As he looked through them every time HARADA took them up for him to see, he must have made correc-

13

tions on each occasion.

14

That is an assumption on your part, is that right?

15 16

After some time had elapsed, when I was rewriting the document, I noticed the corrections.

17 18

THE MONITOR: Correction on the one before the last answer: I believe he made correction on each occasion where he found a mistake.

20 21

22

19

Even though your memory isn't so good, 23 Mrs. KONOYE, can you answer this question: When these 24 corrections were made by Prince SAIONJI, did he ever correct any conversations that Baron HARADA had with

other people?

A I don't recall at all.

Q But your memory is not so good, is it?

A Yes.

THE MONITOR: Just a moment. "As you say," instead of "Yes."

Q When the documents came back from Prince SAIONJI they were put in a vault at the Sumitomo Bank, weren't they?

A As you say.

Q Did anyone else make any corrections on these remembrances of HARADA?

A There were people.

Q How many people besides Prince SAIONJI worked on them?

A I don't think there are any other persons
who made additions to the original, who wrote-- who
made any writings on the original itself, but there
is one who wrote a book based on the original document.

Q Are you sure of that, Mrs. KONOYE?

A I feel sure there is no mistake.

Q As a matter of fact, you were working alongside of a man who was making corrections on that diary, weren't you, down at the Sumitomo Bank?

A Yes, that is so.

Q His name was YAMAUCHI, Hideo; isn't that right?

8

9

10

11

12

0

5

1

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

22

24

The pen name he uses as a novelist is A SATOMI, Ton.

Q He is a writer and he worked on the diary, on the Memoirs, for quite a long period of time correcting them, didn't he?

A I don't remember how long a period of time it was, but anyway it was up to the time the book was published.

9 10

6

7

8

11

12

13 14

B

15.

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

Q And wasn't he working on those corrections at the time that Baron HARADA was quite sick?

A I think it was before Baron HARADA became sick.

CROSS

Q And after he had made many corrections, it was that period of time that you started to rewrite it, isn't that so?

A I think I rewrote the manuscript before Mr. SATOMI began conducting researches in connection with the composition of the book.

And you know, as a matter of fact, don't you, Mrs. KONOYE, that this rewritten version of these memoirs was wholly without any consultation on his part with Baron HARADA, isn't that so?

A My recollection is that he rewrote the manuscript on Baron HARADA's request.

Q That is right; and he was paid for it, isn't that so?

A I don't know anything about that.

Q He was employed to make it grammatically correct, to figure out whether Baron HARADA was referring to the present tense or the past tense and who was speaking in the various conversations, isn't that so?

A I think that was the case.

3

4

6

7

8

10

12 13

14

15 16

> 17 18

19

20

22

23

Q And the way you wrote the entries, isn't it true, Mrs. KONOYE, that it would be difficult for one to determine whether Baron HAHADA was referring to present tense or past tense and it was difficult to determine the predicate and the subject of the sentences, and it was also difficult to tell who was saying what?

A There were many portions which were as you have indicated.

Q And, Mrs. KONOYE, isn't it also a fact that in this script as it was originally written by you it is extremely difficult for one translating it to know to which person Baron HARADA was referring, for example: that the Japanese character as written by you is the same for Home Minister, Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal and Minister of the Imperial Household, isn't that so?

A They weren't at all the same, nor did they resemble each other. My system of shorthand is written according to pronunciation -- correction: is written phonetically, and, therefore, each character was different from the other.

Q I am not talking about your shorthand, Mrs.

KONOYE; I am talking about the document as you re
wrote it after you took it down in shorthand, after it

was dictated to you by Baron HARADA.

A When I transcribed the shorthand notes which I had taken down into Japanese script I tried to avoid the possibility of such mistakes arising and took every care that such confusion would not occur.

Q But, despite the caution that you took, Mrs. KONOYE, isn't it so that that difficulty did arise in the translation?

THE MONITOR: Mr. Logan, do you mean by "translation," translation into English or a translation into a readable Japanese?

MR. LOGAN: Translation into English.

A When I was transcribing my notes, I had great difficulty in *rying to discover just what portion in a given sentence was the subject.

Q And I suppose you did the best you could and wrote it out the way you thought it should be, is that right?

A Maturally, yes.

Q Now, as a matter of fact, Mrs. KONOYE,

SATOMI asked you to rewrite this diary before he

started to work on it, and he asked you to put larger

margins so that he could make his corrections, isn't

that true?

A As you say.

3

1

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

17

16

18

19

21

22

24

And it is also a fact that, after he got finished making all his corrections on it, you rewrote 1 it again, isn't that so? That is a fact. When did you finish working on it? 4 Q I don't recall. So that the remembrances of Baron HARADA as they exist today consist of your interpretation of 7 Baron FanaDA's dictation to you, is that right? The Japanese original of the notes which I transcribed in shorthand into Japanese script is what 10 11 is left today. 12 As corrected by Prince SAIONJI and as cor-13 rected by SATOMI, isn't that so? SATOMI's corrections do not appear on that A 15 16 decument. THE PRESIDENT: All that for nothing. 17 On which document? 18 I don't recall the details. 19 You just said, Mrs. KONOYE, that SATOMI's 20 corrections do not appear on that document. To what 21 22 document are you referring? To the manuscript which HARADA took to 23

24

SAIONJI for correction.

Q On what document did SATOMI's corrections

appear?

A I rewrote the document which HARADA had taken to SAIONJI for correction, and SATOMI corrected the rewritten copy of that document.

Q And then did you rewrite it again?

A Yes.

M & h

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

You state in your affidavit as follows: have been shown by Mr. J. G. Lambert, IPS Investigator, a photostatic copy of this finished transcription which I recognize as the memoirs of Baron HARADA written by me in my own handwriting." Is that photostatic copy that you saw a copy of the document you just spoke about?

Yes.

Mrs. KONOYE, how often during . that ten-year period was Baron HARADA 111?

He was often slightly ill or disposed. How many times he was so disposed I do not remember.

THE MONITOR: Indisposed instead of disposed.

You state that he had one sickness on February 23, 1937. Was that when he had a semi-paralytic stroke?

I found out through looking it up in the diary that HARADA had been ill on the 23rd of February 1937, Er had gone to Oiso.

Well, weren't you taking dictation from him at this period of time?

I was taking dictation.

Wasn't the left half of his body semi-paralyzed?

I don't remember well.

Well, what was the sickness he had on February 23rd?

I have a feeling that he had caught a cold

19 20

21

22

23 24

4

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

on that occasion but the entry does not say that in so rany words.

- Q Again you are relying on your memory?
- A I am.
- Q Now, you say whatever his state of health he occasionally appeared abstracted as though he was thinking of something else. As a matter of fact that was his condition all the time, wasn't it?
- A Not all the time, but once in a while I would get such a feeling.
- Q Hewas a man who had a great imagination, didn't he?
 - A I cannot pass any judgment on that.
 - Q He was very voluble?
 - A He didn't dislike speaking.
- Q It is a fact that when he spoke to somebody sometimes he would appear quite abstracted and when the reply was made he wouldn't understand it, isn't that so?
- A Once in a while I think there were such occasions.
- Q Now, do you recall in 1937, early part, that he requested Marquis KIDO to take his place in so far as acting as secretary to Prince SAIONJI? I don't mean by that the writing of his memoirs.

0

2

20

21 22

23

That isn't in my recollection.

That might have happened without you knowing A it or else you forget it, is that true?

Maybe so.

And isn't it a fact, Mrs. KONOYE, that sometimes he would become sleepy while he was dictating to you or while he was talking to somebody else?

I cannot say that there were no such occasions. MR. LOGAN: I ask that the notebook that I showed Mrs. KONOYE be marked for identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The one volume from which the notes of the HARADA Diary were taken will receive exhibit No. 3752 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the cocument above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3752 for identification.)

MR. LOGAN: May I ask that defense document 2989, excerpt from the diary of Marquis KIDO, February 27, 1937, which I read to the previous witness be marked for identification.

CLIRK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 2989 will receive exhibit No. 3753 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

No. 3753 for identification.)

MR. LOGAN: I forgot about these documents that have bean produced. I ask the witness be shown this document which is chapter 262.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

BY MR. LOGAN (Continued):

Q Mrs. KONOYE, look at that document, see chapter 262 dated February 9, 1938, and the first date mentioned under that as for the first entry is January 21st. Does that mean that the dictation was given to you by Baron HARADA on February 9 and that he was dictating as far back as what occurred on January 21 on that occasion?

A I think so.

Q Now will you look at chapter 264 which is on the table there beside you? It is a different document. You will find that is dated March 4, 1938, and the first date mentioned under that chapter it says on the 21st; I presume it means the 21st of February. Now, does that mean that on March 4, 1938, Baron HARADA dictated to you with respect to events as far back as February 21, 1938?

A I do not recall whether notes which I took down between those two dates were later bound together

in the same volume as the notes taken down at the later date on March 4.

Well, do you know as a fact whether or not you did take any notes between February 21, 1938 and March 4, 1938?

A May I have that repeated, please? (Whereupon, the Japanese court reporter read.)

I don't recall at all.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, there are many other examples with respect to this diary of the difference in dates. It would be supercrogation to go through them all so we will just leave that as an example.

That concludes my cross-examination.

15

10

11

12

13

14

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. KIYOSE, for whom?

DR. KIYOSE: I have one simple question on behalf of the defendant TOJO.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY DR. KIYOSE:

Q In your second affidevit, in the very last paragraph, you have mentioned the entry of 19 August 3940. In this portion it further states that during the cross-examination of the accused TOJO, which was exhibit 3867 for identification, you state that you remembered that when HARADA was dictating this to you he was reading from a document which he held in his hand. Now, I would like to ask you, did you see this particular document?

A I took down what HARADA was dictating to me.

Correction: What HARADA was reading from the document.

Q Then you personally did not see the document, is that not right?

A I don't think I did.

Q Did Baron HARADA tell you, in addition to dictating from this document, tell you anything as to the nature of that document?

A I do not recall.

Q Then you are not able to tell us whether this document was written by HARADA himself or given to him

4

1

2

7

10

11

12

13

2

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

24

by some other person, is that not right? Correction:
Then you are not able to tell us, are you, whether
HARADA compiled this document himself, or whether it
it was given to him by somebody else?

A I merely recall that he read the original document.

DR. KIYOSE: This concludes my cross-examination.
THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren.

MR. WARKEN: Mrs. -- Miss KONOYE --

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Corr.

MR. COMYNS CARK: Your Honor, in my submission there should be some limit on the number of counsel entitled to cross-examine one witness. I did not object to Dr. KIYOSE because there are specific references to his client in the witness' affidavit. But the general objection has been fully covered by Mr. Logan, and in my submission counsel for other accused not specifically mentioned in the affidavit have no right to further cross-examine.

MA. WARREN: Your Honor, since there are references in the affidavit to the diary, and since there are many references to my client HIRANUMA, I desire to put about three questions to this witness.

THE PRESIDENT: You don't propose to cover the same ground as Mr. Logan and Dr. KIYOSE?

4

6

.

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

22

23

MR. WARREN: Not at all, sir. I think I can handle it in one question.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, put the question.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. W.RKEN:

11

12

13

19

20

21

22

23

Q Miss KONOYE, is it not a fact that both Baron HARADA and Prince SAIONJI intensely disliked Baron HIRANUMA?

Mr. WARREN: One of the counsel has asked me to ask one more question which I think is very pertinent.

THE PRESIDENT: No answer to this yet.

- A From my side I am not in a position to be able to tell you anything about that.
- 15 Q Now, did you show the final memoir to HaNADa after SATOMI corrected it - I mean that should be HARADA corrected it -- and you rewrote it?

18 Let me withdraw the question and ask it again because there is confusion on it.

Did you show the final memoir to HARADA after SATOMI corrected it and you rewrote it?

I den't know about that.

Mk. BROOKS: If your Honor please, I wanted to 24 25 cross-examine this witness on the original documents, and I had asked the prosecution to produce the first

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

25

and last of the series of this diary. I understand it is available.

THE PRESIDENT: I understood Mr. Carr to say it wasn't in his possession.

MR. BROOKS: Well, it isn't in my possession either, but as I understood he knew where it was, that it had been turned back to the family, and I thought it being so close to recess time that over night there might be some information for it for in the morning.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we still have five minutes. We don't want to waste five minutes.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, whether we can procure the production of the original documents of which we have the photostats or not I don't at this moment know. I didn't know there was any question about it. There is no dispute that these are photostats taken from the original, and I den't see how it could help anybody to see that of which we have a precise photostatic copy.

THE PRESIDENT: Unless it is suggested that part of the sheet was covered over while being photo-24 stated, and that would be an extreme suggestion to make.

MR. BROOKS: If your Honors please, since the testimeny in this room this efterneen I think we can

see the reason. I want to know what that is a photostat of.

THE PRESIDENT: The photostat will tell you. Mk. BROOKS: Not having seen the criginal I have not had a chance to compare it, and I think --THE PRESIDENT: The photostat would or should tell you all that the original can tell you; I assume it is a facsimile.

MR. BROCKS: Assuming that I am willing to take the prosecution's word that it is a photostat of the original, I den't know or see any evidence here that there was an original outside of the photostat.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think we ought to delay the proceedings making comparisons of the original and the photostat.

We will adjourn until half past nine tomorrow norning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Fride,, 16 January 1948, at 0930.)

23 24

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22